

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weck et al. (U.S. 6,554,753) in view of Hsu (U.S. 6,746,372). Claim 2 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Drawings

It is noted that no Patent Drawing Review (Form PTO-948) was received with the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant must assume that the drawings are acceptable as filed.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 2 and has amended claim 1 of this application. It is believed that amended claim 1 specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner has indicated that claim 2 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Applicant's amended claim 1 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 2, thus, redrafting claim 2 in independent form. Original claims 3-6 each depend from amended claim 1. In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claim 1, it is not believed that any detailed discussion of the cited prior art references is necessary. Suffice to say that all the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 28, 2004

By: 

Bruce H. Troxell

Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707